

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 6, 2010 (the "*Office Action*"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-24, and 26-38 were pending. Claims 17-23 and 32-35 were withdrawn and Claims 1, 3-16, 24, 26-31, 36, and 37 were rejected. Applicants amend Claims 1 and 24, without prejudice or disclaimer. The Examiner has withdrawn Claim 38. Claims 2 and 25 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants' amendments have been made to advance prosecution of the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in view of the following remarks.

Formal Drawings

The *Office Action* does not address Applicants' previous submission of formal drawings filed concurrently with Applicants' Amendment dated February 18, 2010. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate acceptance and approval of the formal drawings.

Election/Restrictions

The Examiner has withdrawn Claim 38 from consideration. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Claim 38. In order to advance prosecution, however, applicants will not pursue examination of Claim 38 at this time.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 8-12, 24, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,321,864 issued to Gendler ("*Gendler*"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Gendler* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, either expressly or inherently, each limitation recited in Applicants' Claim 1. For example, *Gendler* fails to disclose:

determining, for each request, at least one data item
type to be provided by the requesting user, wherein:

the at least one data item type determined for each request is based on a type of service selected, by the user, using the form presented on the user interface; and communicating an indication of the at least one data item type for each request for approval for display on the user interface of the client device associated with the requesting user, wherein the form presented on the user interface comprises a separate approval indicator for each selected service

as recited in Claim 1. *Gendler* discloses that “the user is able to identify the proper personnel required to approve the [R]FA.” Col. 8, ll. 8-9. *Gendler* further discloses:

Different rules are capable of being set in the database 122 of system 100 such that depending on the scope of the project (typically the total dollar amount) the number of approvals will change. For example, for larger projects (e.g., above \$100,000) a business unit executive 366 will be required to approve the RFA.

Col. 8, ll. 13-18. The Examiner states that “[b]ased on the type of the service (i.e. large project) that the user [sic] requesting, different types of roles will be selected.” *Office Action* at 3. That different personnel may be required to approve an RFA for “larger projects” does not disclose “a type of service **selected, by the user, using the form presented on the user interface**” let alone that “the at least one data item type determined for each request is based on a type of service selected, by the user, using the form presented on the user interface,” as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, the different personnel to approve an RFA, as disclosed by *Gendler*, fails to disclose “the at least one data item type determined for each request is based on a type of service selected, by the user, using the form presented on the user interface . . . **wherein the form presented on the user interface comprises a separate approval indicator for each selected service,**” as recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, *Gendler* fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 along with its dependent claims.

Independent Claim 24 recites certain limitations that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with reference to independent Claim 1, *Gendler* does not disclose, teach,

or suggest. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 24 together with its dependent claims.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37

The Examiner rejects Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gendler*. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-7 and 13, which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 26-27 and 36-37, which depend from Claim 24, are patentable over *Gendler* because the reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and also recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggest in *Gendler*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37.

Claims 14 and 31

The Examiner rejects Claims 14 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gendler* in view of Official Notice as evidenced by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0179790 issued to Leitch et al. ("*Leitch*"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14, which depends from Claim 1, and Claim 31, which depends from Claim 24, are patentable over *Gendler* in view of *Leitch* because each and every limitation as recited in Applicants' claims is not taught by *Gendler* in view of *Leitch*. Claims 14 and 31 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and also recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Gendler*. The Examiner's reliance on *Leitch* does not correct the deficiencies of *Gendler*.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 14 and 31.

Claims 15-16 and 30

The Examiner rejects Claims 15-16 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gendler* in view of Official Notice as evidenced by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0040313 issued to Hunter et al. ("*Hunter*"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15-16, which depend from Claim 1, and Claim 30, which depends from Claim 24, are patentable over *Gendler* in view of *Hunter* because each and every limitation as recited in Applicants' claims is not taught by *Gendler* in view of *Hunter*. Claims 15-16 and 30 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and also recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Gendler*. The Examiner's reliance on *Hunter* does not correct the deficiencies of *Gendler*.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 15-16 and 30.

No Waiver

Applicants' arguments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the additional statements. The distinctions between the applied references and the claims are provided as examples only and are sufficient to overcome the rejections. Applicants reserve the right to discuss additional or other distinctions in a later response or on appeal, if appropriate.

CONCLUSION


Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for Applicants at the Examiner's convenience.

No fees are believed to be due; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or to credits to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Christa Brown-Sanford
Reg. No. 58,503
(214) 415-6824

Date: January 5, 2011

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. **05073**